DOCUMENT RESUME

FL 000 981

ED 025 173

By- Moreland, Floyd L.

From Amo, Amas, Amat to Vergil in Ten Weeks: A Report on the Berkeley 1967 Summer Latin Workshop.

Foreign Language Association of Northern Calif., Inc.
Pub Date May 68
Note- 2p.
Journal Cit- Northern California Foreign Language Newsletter; v16 n65 p8-9 May 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.20
Descriptors- Academic Achievement, Accelerated Courses, Classical Literature, College Language Programs, Course Content, Experimental Teaching, *Graduate Study, Honors Classes, *Intensive Language Courses, *Latin, Second Language Learning, *Student Needs, *Summer Workshops, Teaching Methods

A 10-week accelerated summer Latin workshop was held for graduate students and undergraduate honor students. The course included a rapid introduction to basic Latin morphology and syntax and careful reading of selected poetry and prose. Course content, teaching methods, and student achievement are briefly discussed. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

From AMO, AMAS, AMAT To Vergil in Ten Weeks

ED025173

A Report on the Berkeley 1967 Summer Latin Workshop

The multiple difficulties involved in teaching an ancient language are well known to teachers of the Classics. Nowadays, when students are introduced to Latin or Greek at a relatively late age—most frequently in college, sometimes in high school, rarely earlier than this—there is little opportunity for a gradual, methodical approach. There is need for new programs which maintain high standards, and at the same time are so streamlined that they arouse and sustain interest. Good literature —which is, after all, the reason for studying the language in the first place—must be introduced as early as possible, yet without sacrificing the solid linguistic foundation which is necessary to the most rudimentary interpretation of ancient texts. The difficulties are especially forbidding for those graduate students of modern literature and other related fields who find they must or would like to acquire a reading knowledge of Greek or Latin in preparing for their Ph.D. degrees. Since the average graduate student cannot normally afford to spend a full year or more learning the basic forms and functions of the language, there is an obvious need for a program designed to hasten the process, so that one intensive quarter or semester might enable a good student to enroll in an upper-division course or at least to read literary texts of reasonable difficulty on his own.

The need for an approach of this type was recognized at Berkeley, and Professors William S. Anderson (Latin and Comparative Literature) and Alain Renoir (English and Comparative Literature) conceived the idea of an accelerated summer Latin Workshop. The course, which was offered for the first time in the summer of 1967, and which earned fifteen quarter credits, was sponsored jointly by the departments of Classics and Comparative Literature. It was designed to give graduates and undergraduate honor students a rapid introduction to basic Latin morphology and syntax, as well as experience in careful reading of selected poetry and prose. It met four hours a day, five days a week, and included intensive grammar drill, laboratory exercises, and literary discussions. The enrollment was limited to sixteen, and there were three faculty members: Alva Bennett (Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of California at Santa Barbara, and Director of the Berkeley Summer Workshop), and Miss Mary-Kay Gamel and myself, both Acting Instructors in Comparative Literature for the summer quarter. This yielded a student-faculty ratio of just over 5/1.

All the forms and functions of Latin were covered during the first five weeks. A two-hour lecture in the morning was followed by two hours of drill in the afternoon, when the students were divided into two sections of eight each. In order to provide intensive drill material, we wrote and recorded a series of tapes for the Workshop, each of an hour's duration. The purpose of the language laboratory was certainly not to get students to speak Latin. Our approach cannot rightly be labeled aural-oral, for whatever the value of such a process in modern-language learning (and in Latin, for that matter), such a system would not have been appropriate to our particular aims. Rather, the laboratory sessions were used to drill the forms, to increase speed and familiarity with patterns, and to develop, as well as possible in the short time allotted, an active sense of a "dead" language. The student always had a complete transcript before him while participating in the exercise, for experimentation quickly demonstrated that the advantages of completely automatic oral response in Latin were dubious. In the laboratory, moreover, each student could recite and answer questions for the entire hour instead of having to wait his turn, while the instructor monitoring the session had the opportunity to observe and correct student performance. Furthermore we found the tapes extremely useful in instilling a "feel" for the quantitative scansion of Latin poetry.

As the first five weeks progressed, we began introducing sight reading of graded material in the afternoon sections, and finally at the end of the five weeks the students began tackling real Latin. The morning sessions now became concerned with matters of translation and literary interpretation, while in the afternoon we dealt in greater detail with more difficult parts of the text at hand, and provided our own copious exercises based on the vocabulary and grammatical constructions encountered in the assigned text. The required Latin readings were the following:

Caesar, *Gallic Wars* VI, chapters 11-24.

Cicero, *Manilian Law*, chapters 27-47.

Ovid, *Amores* I.4, II.19; *Tristia* III.2; *Metamorphoses* I.478-567, 583-663, III.173-252, 425-473.

Vergil, *Aeneid*, I.1-156, 198-207, 223-296, IV.9-30, 160-197, 663-705.

Horace, *Odes*, I.4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 33.

Catullus 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 45, 49, 51, 70, 72, 85, 87, 92, 101.

These assignments were supplemented by selections from Ovid, Cicero, Seneca, Propertius, and medieval authors read at sight. I am offering this list principally to show the range and amount of reading done by the Workshop students, but I do not propose it as ideal. Indeed, much of it will be changed when we offer the Workshop for the second time, in the summer of 1968. The students liked being able to read real Latin authors, but many were discouraged by the difficulties encountered in the Caesar passage, and not sufficiently rewarded by the delights of subject or style—but this objection boils down to a very familiar problem. In contrast, Catullus was enthusiastically received because of his themes, tone, brevity, and relative simplicity. As the first narrative poet to be studied, Ovid was found difficult at first, but became much more easy by the end of the week (we devoted approximately one week to each author), and as with Catullus, the discovery that Latin did not have to be marmoreal was a refreshing one for the students. Vergil and Horace were quite successful, in spite of the length of the assignments. Opinions differed about Cicero: in addition to carping at the difficulties, students found the rather florid oratory of the chosen passage bombastic, and some preferred the selections from Ciceronian philosophy (*De Senectute, De Finibus*) which were given for sight reading. The contrast between Ciceronian and Senecan style, so important a controversy for anyone interested in the question of style, was found most instructive.

Our demands were rigid, and we expected students to have a very firm syntactical and structural knowledge of the language while encouraging them to read the selected passages with appreciation. We were not content with mere translation of the Latin into English, but we required them to be on the lookout for grammatical peculiarities, to scan the poetry according to the rules of quantitative rhythm, and to make responsible observations about the relation of the metrical structure to the significance of the rhetorical, its music, and its flow. And we consistently used literary discussion to motivate students and give general background material.

In addition to all the food for thought, some concern was lavished on "inferior regions." Once a week the group met for

ED025173 FL 000 981

dinner and a short "allocution" by a distinguished guest lecturer. These discussions were meant to introduce students to the various aspects of Latin literature and greater heights.

Besides two midterm examinations and numerous quizzes, a six-hour final examination was administered. The results were generally impressive. Most students, in addition to performing well on grammatical, rhetorical, and metrical questions, could sight-read passages from Cicero and Ovid (without a dictionary or other aids) most admirably. The clearest indication of achievement is the fact that a majority of the students went on to upper division Latin courses in the fall and winter quarters and experienced no difficulty in keeping up with others who had worked their way through the regular lower division Latin sequence. This result of the experiment was of special interest to the Department of Comparative Literature, which requires upper division work in either Greek or Latin from all doctoral students and undergraduate candidates for honors. Favorable reports keep coming in, and the success of the program can be inferred from the fact that it will be doubled in size in 1968—five faculty members under the direction of W. R. Johnson, Assistant Professor of Classics at Berkeley, and thirty-two students. Rumors are in the air that a Greek Workshop may be started within the not too distant future, and it would not be at all surprising if similar courses began popping up in the modern languages. We believe our Latin Workshop has had the advantage of engaging a graduate student's total attention for a full quarter, of developing not only a reading knowledge but a broad perspective of the culture focused on the language in a space of time compatible with the multiple pressures on graduate students, and of encouraging some students to continue their work in the language in an area relevant to their particular specialties.—*Floyd L. Moreland,* Teaching Assistant in Classics at the University of California, Berkeley

Note of the Editor—Such intensive courses in Foreign Languages would certainly be an answer to the needs of many primary and secondary teachers wishing a fast review of a given language without going abroad. We dare to express the hope that they may become a reality in the near future.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Foreign Language NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVI, No. 65
May, 1968

published by
THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA